

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION

CLEVELAND BROWNS FOOTBALL	)	CASE NO. 1:24-cv-01857
COMPANY LLC,	)	JUDGE DAVID A. RUIZ
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	
v.	)	ORDER
CITY OF CLEVELAND,	)	
	)	
Defendant,	)	
	)	
STATE OF OHIO,	)	
	)	
Intervenor.	)	

On October 24, 2024, Plaintiff Cleveland Browns Football Company LLC filed this action against Defendant City of Cleveland. (R. 1). On November 14, Defendant filed an unopposed motion for a thirty-day extension of time to respond to the Complaint as Defendant was “in the process of” retaining outside counsel. (R. 10). The Court extended the deadline to answer to December 16. On November 15, Plaintiff filed its Amended Complaint. (R. 12). Defendant then retained outside counsel on December 9. (R. 20, PageID# 95). Defendant now requests that the deadline to respond be extended to January 15, 2025, to allow its recently retained outside “counsel sufficient time to respond to” the Amended Complaint. *Id.* Plaintiff opposes Defendant’s motion and consents to only a one-week extension. (R. 21. PageID# 98–101).

Rule 6(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure governs requests for extension of time. “When an act may or must be done within a specified time,” if a party moves for an extension “before the original time or its extension expires,” then a court “may, for good cause, extend the time.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1)(A). Retaining new counsel qualifies as good cause for a thirty-day

extension of time to respond to a complaint. *See Darling v. Lake Cnty. Bd. of Comm'rs*, No. 1:12cv194, 2012 WL 1902602, at \*7 (N.D. Ohio May 25, 2012) (defendants demonstrated good cause for a nineteen-day extension based solely on their recent retention of counsel); *see also Doe v. Ohio Hi-Point Sch. Dist. Bd. of Educ.*, No. 2:20cv4798, 2022 WL 4357566, at \*5 (S.D. Ohio Sept. 20, 2022) (a defendant “demonstrated good cause to warrant an extension of” forty-five days to answer the complaint when he retained “additional counsel”). In addition, there is no evidence the motion was filed in bad faith or for unnecessary delay. Therefore, the Court finds good cause to grant Defendant’s motion. The deadline for Defendant to respond to the Amended Complaint is January 15, 2025.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 13, 2024

s/ David A. Ruiz

David A. Ruiz  
United States District Judge